

Radiatively Generated ν_e oscillations: General Analysis, Textures and Models

Anjan S. Joshipura and Saurabh D. Rindani

*Theoretical Physics Group, Physical Research Laboratory,
Navrangpura, Ahmedabad 380 009, India.*

()

Abstract

We study the consequences of assuming that the mass scale $\Delta_\odot$ corresponding to the solar neutrino oscillations and mixing angle U_{e3} corresponding to the electron neutrino oscillation at CHOOZ are radiatively generated through the standard electroweak gauge interactions. All the leptonic mass matrices having zero $\Delta_\odot$ and U_{e3} at a high scale lead to a unique low energy value for the $\Delta_\odot$ which is determined by the (known) size of the radiative corrections, solar and the atmospheric mixing angle and the Majorana mass of the neutrino observed in neutrinoless double beta decay. This prediction leads to the following consequences: (i) The MSSM radiative corrections generate only the dark side of the solar neutrino solutions. (ii) The inverted mass hierarchy $(m, -m, 0)$ at the high scale fails in generating the LMA solution but it can lead to the LOW or vacuum solutions. (iii) The $\Delta_\odot$ generated in models with maximal solar mixing at a high scale is zero to the lowest order in the radiative parameter. It tends to get suppressed as a result of this and lies in the vacuum region. We discuss specific textures which can lead to the LMA solution in the present framework and provide a gauge theoretical realization of this in the context of the seesaw model.

I. INTRODUCTION

The large amount of information gathered from solar and atmospheric neutrino experiments provides a detailed probe of the neutrino mass spectrum [1]. The quark-lepton symmetry implemented in the seesaw model for neutrino masses prefers hierarchical neutrino masses [2]. This pattern can easily explain the mass scales involved in neutrino oscillations, but obtaining two large mixing angles required phenomenologically needs considerable changes in the simple seesaw schemes. Still, many schemes can accommodate large mixing in the seesaw picture [3,4].

The alternative to a hierarchical neutrino spectrum is the presence of a pseudo-Dirac state corresponding to two nearly degenerate neutrinos with splitting much smaller than their overall mass scale. The third neutrino may be much lighter than this mass (leading to inverted hierarchy) or can be close to it giving an almost degenerate spectrum [5]. Unlike in the hierarchical spectrum, large mixing angles can be quite natural in such schemes and various models [6,7,8,9] predicting these mass patterns also predict large or maximal mixing angles.

There are two physically different zeroth order realizations of a pseudo-Dirac neutrino in the case of two generations, say, e and μ . These are given by the following mass matrices:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & m \\ m & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ b & -a \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

Both these matrices give equal and opposite eigenvalues at the tree level. The one in eq. (1) is invariant under the $L_e - L_\mu$ symmetry. The neutrinos remain as a Dirac particle as long as this symmetry remains exact but its breaking would lead to splitting among neutrinos. The $L_e - L_\mu$ symmetry cannot be broken by the standard electroweak interactions and one needs to invoke additional interactions to obtain a Dirac neutrino from eq. (1). The matrix of eq. (2) is quite different. The mass eigenstates emerging from eq. (2) also form a Dirac neutrino pair due to equal and opposite eigenvalues but the charged current interactions defined in this mass basis of the degenerate pairs violate lepton number [10]. As a consequence, the standard electroweak interactions radiatively generate neutrino splitting

unlike in the case of eq. (1). Thus the matrix in eq. (2) intrinsically defines a pseudo-Dirac pair. Both the matrices also differ phenomenologically since the one in eq. (1) leads to practically maximal mixing while the mixing angle is arbitrary in the case of eq. (2).

We can also divide pseudo-Dirac neutrinos into two different categories on phenomenological grounds, one in which the effective neutrino mass probed through neutrinoless double beta decay ($0\nu\beta\beta$) is comparable to the mass of the neutrino pair, and the other in which it is much smaller. These two cases are exemplified by eq. (2) and eq. (1) respectively.

We need 3×3 generalizations of eq. (2) for phenomenological purposes. It is possible to write such generalizations [11,12] and to go even one step further and classify all the allowed forms of neutrino mass matrices which lead to a pseudo-Dirac neutrino after inclusion of the standard weak radiative corrections. Conditions for this to happen were studied in [11]. General solutions of these conditions in CP conserving theories were worked out [13] under an assumption that the element U_{e3} of the neutrino mixing matrix U is zero at a high scale. Both the solar scale and the U_{e3} get generated at a low scale μ after radiative corrections are included. But these quantities get related to low energy observables [13]. Specifically, one gets the following unique prediction in this case:

$$\Delta_{\odot} \cos 2\theta_{\odot} = 4\delta_{\tau} \sin^2 \theta_A |m_{ee}|^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta_{\tau}^2) . \quad (3)$$

Here $\Delta_{\odot}$ is the mass-squared difference responsible for the solar neutrino oscillation, and the angles $\theta_{\odot}$ and θ_A respectively denote the solar and atmospheric mixing angles at a low scale. m_{ee} is the effective neutrino mass probed in the $0\nu\beta\beta$ decay and δ_{τ} specifies the size of the radiative correction induced by the Yukawa coupling of the τ :

$$\delta_{\tau} \approx c \left(\frac{m_{\tau}}{4\pi v} \right)^2 \ln \frac{M_X}{M_Z} . \quad (4)$$

$c = \frac{3}{2}, -\frac{1}{\cos^2 \beta}$ in the case of the standard model (SM), and the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM), respectively [14,15,16].

The prediction in eq. (3) is independent of the detailed form of the neutrino and charged-lepton mass matrices at a high scale and holds also in the presence of CP violation [17]. The only assumption is that the leptonic mass matrices yield a degenerate neutrino pair and vanishing U_{e3} at a high scale. This remarkably general relation shows a strong correlation between the solar scale and m_{ee} . In particular, the LMA solution requires [13] m_{ee} to be close to the present experimental limit [18].

In this paper, we study consequences of the general picture discussed above and discuss some specific textures and their gauge theoretical realizations. Our basic assumptions are (a) CP conservation (b) vanishing U_{e3} at a high scale (c) neutrino masses with high-scale

eigenvalues $m, -m, m'$ (d) the presence of only standard weak radiative corrections either in SM or in MSSM. Three general consequences follow from these assumptions: (i) The inverted mass hierarchy among neutrinos is inconsistent with the large mixing angle solution (LMA) to the solar neutrino problem but the LOW solution is allowed by it. (ii) The assumption of maximal solar mixing angle at a high scale also fails in reproducing the solar scale required for either the LMA or the LOW solution in SM but it can account for the $\Delta_\odot$ corresponding to the VAC solution. (iii) Radiative corrections in MSSM cannot reproduce any solution of the solar neutrino problem which require $\tan^2 \theta_\odot \leq 1$.

The next section is devoted to a discussion of our basic scheme and the above mentioned general results. Then we discuss some specific high scale textures for the neutrino and charged-lepton mass matrices which are phenomenologically viable. We describe in Section 4 a realization of one of these textures in the context of the standard seesaw model augmented with a horizontal $SU(2) \times U(1)$ symmetry.

II. CONSEQUENCES OF A PSEUDO-DIRAC STRUCTURE

We first summarize the basic framework and main results of ref [11,13] and then discuss their consequences.

Consider a CP conserving theory specified by a general 3×3 real symmetric neutrino mass matrix $M_{\nu 0}$. This matrix can always be specified in the flavor basis corresponding to a diagonal charged-lepton mass matrix. We adopt the following parameterization for $M_{\nu 0}$ in this basis.

$$M_{\nu 0} = \begin{pmatrix} s_1 & t & u \\ t & s_2 & v \\ u & v & s_3 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

Assume that the above $M_{\nu 0}$ describes physics at a high scale M_X . $M_{\nu 0}$ is required to yield vanishing solar scale and CHOOZ angle at M_X . We require that $M_{\nu 0}$ has eigenvalues $(m, -m, m')$. This happens if [11]

$$tr(M_{\nu 0}) \sum_i \Delta_i = det M_{\nu 0} , \quad (6)$$

where Δ_i represents the determinant of the 2×2 block of $M_{\nu 0}$ obtained by blocking the i^{th} row and column. When the above condition is satisfied, eigenvalues of $M_{\nu 0}$ are given in terms of invariants of $M_{\nu 0}$

$$m \equiv \sqrt{-\sum_i \Delta_i} \quad ; \quad m' = T \equiv \text{tr}(M_{\nu 0}) \quad (7)$$

A general solution of eq. (6) can be obtained if one further assumes that U_{e3} is zero at M_X . This solution corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} v^2 &= (s_1 + s_2)(s_1 + s_3) ; \\ t &= -\frac{uv}{s_1 + s_2} . \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The above equations ensure the degeneracy (up to a sign) of two states and vanishing U_{e3} at a high scale. Radiative corrections to $M_{\nu 0}$ can be incorporated in the standard way [15]. It was shown [11,13] that the radiative corrections do not destabilize the basic structure. Their main effect is to generate the solar scale $\Delta_\odot$ and U_{e3} . The $\Delta_\odot$ obtained after radiative corrections is related to m_{ee} by eq. (3) for all neutrino mass matrices whose elements (in the flavour basis) satisfy eq. (8). The other observables are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tan^2 \theta_A &\approx \frac{u^2}{t^2} + \mathcal{O}(\delta_\tau), \\ \tan^2 \theta_\odot &= \frac{m - m_{ee}}{m + m_{ee}} + \mathcal{O}(\delta_\tau^2), \\ \Delta_A &\approx |m^2 - T^2| . \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

m is the common mass of the degenerate pair¹ and is given from eq. (7,8) by

$$m = \sqrt{m_{ee}^2 + t^2 + u^2} \quad (10)$$

All the results presented here are independent of the specific structures for the charged-lepton and neutrino mass matrices. We use these results now to discuss several interesting and fairly model-independent consequences.

A. Radiative corrections and MSSM

The available solar neutrino results are known to significantly constrain [19] the solar scale $\Delta_\odot$ and the mixing $\theta_\odot$, particularly after [20] the recent neutral current results from SNO [21]. Based on the global analysis of all the solar data, the only solutions allowed at 3σ level are the large mixing angle (LMA) solution and the LOW or quasi vacuum

¹We have neglected here an inconsequential numerical factor [15] corresponding to the overall renormalization of the neutrino mass matrix in eq. (5).

[22]. The allowed ranges of parameters in these cases at 3σ are given approximately by $\Delta_\odot \approx 3 \cdot 10^{-4} - 2 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$ and $\tan^2 \theta_\odot \sim 0.2 - 0.9$ in case of the LMA solution and $\Delta_\odot \approx 3 \cdot 10^{-8} - 1 \cdot 10^{-7} \text{ eV}^2$ and $\tan^2 \theta_\odot \sim 0.4 - 0.9$ in case of the LOW solution. The small mixing angle solution is excluded at 3σ . The solar mixing angle is found to be less than 45° ($\tan^2 \theta_\odot \leq 0.84$) in all the preferred solutions, a fact which plays an important role in the following.

The predicted values of $\Delta_\odot$ and U_{e3} are different in SM and MSSM due to different values of δ_τ in these two cases. In case of the SM, $\delta_\tau \sim 10^{-5}$ while it can become larger for the MSSM due to the presence of $\tan \beta$. More importantly, the sign of δ_τ is different in these two cases. The negative values of δ_τ for MSSM makes it unsuitable for the description of the solar data. This important result is a direct consequence of the general prediction in eq.(3). It implies that the $\Delta_\odot \cos 2\theta_\odot \leq 0$ as long as m_{ee} is not suppressed², typically if $m_{ee}^2 \geq m^2 \delta_\tau$. But the preferred solar neutrino solutions LMA and LOW require a positive $\Delta_\odot \cos 2\theta_\odot$. Hence these solutions cannot be realized in the case of MSSM. The best fit point for the vacuum solution falls in this dark zone [22] and hence this solution can in principle be realized. This would require $|m_{ee}|^2 \sim (m \cos 2\theta_\odot)^2 \leq 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$ since $\delta_\tau \geq 10^{-5}$ in case of the MSSM.

B. Inverted mass hierarchy

The pattern of neutrino masses m_{ν_i} corresponding to the relation

$$m_{\nu_1} \sim m_{\nu_2} \gg m_{\nu_3}$$

is termed as the inverted mass hierarchy. If the solar scale is generated radiatively then the inverted mass pattern at the low scale would correspond to the masses $(m, -m, m' \ll m)$ at the high scale. A simple realization of this pattern is provided by the $L_e - L_\mu - L_\tau$ symmetry [7,8] which leads to neutrino masses $(m, -m, 0)$. The mass m is identified with the atmospheric scale and a small breaking of the $L_e - L_\mu - L_\tau$ symmetry can generate the solar scale. Such breaking can come from the standard radiative corrections [8,6,11] or from additional interactions [7]. We now show that if the standard radiative breaking is responsible for the generation of the solar scale as in [6,8] then one cannot obtain the LMA

²It may be possible for the MSSM radiative corrections to account for the solar scale through $\mathcal{O}(\delta_\tau^2)$ corrections if m_{ee} is close to zero. We shall present an explicit example of this latter on.

solution of the solar neutrino problem in case of the inverted hierarchy. Our conclusion is not restricted only to the $L_e - L_\mu - L_\tau$ symmetric models but holds in case of all the models with the inverted mass pattern ($m, -m, m' \ll m$) and vanishing U_{e3} at a high scale. It follows from eq. (7) that this pattern is obtained in all the models in which the neutrino mass matrix has vanishing or very small trace ($T \ll m$). Models with $L_e - L_\mu - L_\tau$ symmetry provide one example of this. In all these models, the common mass m of the degenerate pair needs to be identified with the atmospheric neutrino mass scale. Eq. (10) then implies

$$m_{ee}^2 \leq m^2 \approx \Delta_A$$

showing that in models with inverted mass hierarchy the $0\nu\beta\beta$ decay scale can at most be of the order of the atmospheric scale. This then restricts the allowed values of the solar scale due to the strong correlation eq. (3) that exists between the $\Delta_\odot$ and m_{ee} . The parameter δ_τ appearing in eq. (3) is given by eq. (4). Since MSSM is unable to reproduce the solar mixing, there is no arbitrariness in the choice of δ_τ whose numerical value is fixed here to be $\sim 3 \times 10^{-5}$. The $\cos 2\theta_\odot$ is required to be in the range $0.08 - 0.6$ for the LMA solution at 3σ . Taking the extreme and the most favourable values for the parameters within the allowed range, we obtain from eq. (3)

$$\Delta_\odot \leq 5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ eV}^2, \quad (11)$$

where we have chosen $m_{ee}^2 = \Delta_A = (.08)^2 \text{ eV}^2$. This value of $\Delta_\odot$ still falls short of the value required for the LMA solution $\sim (2.3 - 37) \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$.

It follows that the inverted hierarchy cannot be reconciled with the radiatively generated LMA solution. Although we assumed zero U_{e3} at a high scale, the correction to the radiatively generated $\Delta_\odot$ coming from a non-zero U_{e3} is expected to be $\sim \delta_\tau \Delta_{\text{atm}} U_{e3}$ since there is only one mass scale corresponding to $m^2 \sim \Delta_{\text{atm}}$ in the inverted hierarchy scheme. This correction is smaller compared to the LMA scale for $U_{e3} \sim 0.1$ and $\delta_\tau \sim 10^{-5}$. Thus inclusion of a non-zero U_{e3} is unlikely to change the above conclusion at least in the case of the standard model.

C. Maximal solar mixing at high scale

The required large solar mixing angle has led to a hypothesis of a maximal solar mixing angle. This together with the large atmospheric mixing leads to bi-maximal mixing pattern which has been studied quite extensively [9]. This possibility is theoretically attractive [23] since maximal mixing can be obtained by imposing some symmetry. The present solar data

do not favour this possibility. It is still possible that the neutrino mass matrix at high scale corresponds to bi-maximal mixing and radiative corrections lead [17,24,25] to departure from this.

We investigate this possibility in the present context assuming maximal solar mixing and a degenerate neutrino mass pair with masses m and $-m$ in a CP conserving theory at a high scale. The maximal solar mixing automatically implies vanishing U_{e3} and thus our formalism applies to this case without further assumptions. For zero U_{e3} and equal and opposite masses, the high scale solar mixing angle θ_0 is given by

$$\tan^2 \theta_0 = \frac{m - m_{ee}}{m + m_{ee}}, \quad (12)$$

It is seen that the assumption of maximal mixing corresponds to assuming that m_{ee} is zero at a high scale. The standard radiative corrections result [15] in flavour dependent renormalization of each elements of the neutrino mass matrix. As a consequence m_{ee} (which is the 11 element of the neutrino mass matrix) remains zero in low energy theory and the solar angle does not receive any corrections at $\mathcal{O}(\delta_\tau)$, see eq. (9). Thus solar mixing remains maximal to this order. More importantly, vanishing of m_{ee} implies through eq.(3) that the predicted solar scale arise only at $\mathcal{O}(\delta_\tau^2)$ and hence is generically suppressed and can at most correspond to the vacuum solution with values of $\delta_\tau \sim 10^{-5}$, ruling out the possibility of maximal mixing and the LMA solution in the present context. CP conservation assumed here is crucial. If CP violating Majorana phases are included then the maximal solar mixing at a high scale does not necessarily imply vanishing m_{ee} . The maximal high scale mixing becomes a viable possibility in this case [17].

III. TEXTURES AND MODELS

Eq. (8), leading to a degenerate pair and vanishing U_{e3} allow for a large number of models for neutrino masses. These conditions presuppose non-trivial relations among elements of the neutrino mass matrix. It might therefore be thought that such relations would represent a fine-tuned possibility and cannot easily be obtained from a symmetry. This is not so. We present here explicit textures which make these relations quite natural and show how these textures can be obtained within a gauge-theoretical framework.

A. Textures

The first texture we discuss was postulated [6] long ago and is also argued to emerge from a symmetry [26]. This corresponds to the following neutrino mass matrix in the flavour basis:

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_{\nu_0} &= m R_{23}(\theta_2) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & z \end{pmatrix} R_{23}^T(\theta_2) , \\
 &= m \begin{pmatrix} 0 & c_2 & -s_2 \\ c_2 & s_2^2 z & s_2 c_2 z \\ -s_2 & s_2 c_2 z & c_2^2 z \end{pmatrix}
 \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

$R_{23}(\theta_2)$ denotes here a rotation in the 23 plane with an angle θ_2 ; $s_2 = \sin \theta_2$, $c_2 = \cos \theta_2$ and $z = \frac{m'}{m}$. z is assumed real. The above mass matrix satisfies the general conditions in eq. (8) and therefore leads to vanishing CHOOZ angle and a degenerate pair. The 11 element of this matrix is zero. Thus it provides a specific example of the general models with maximal mixing discussed in the previous section. As eq. (3) shows, one has vanishing solar scale to leading order in radiative corrections δ_τ . The $\Delta_\odot$ is however generated at higher order in δ_τ and was shown [6] to be

$$\Delta_\odot \approx -\frac{m^3}{m' - m} \delta_\tau^2 \sin^2 2\theta_A \tag{14}$$

Remembering that $\delta_\tau^2 \approx 10^{-10}$ in the case of SM, we see that the above texture leads to the vacuum solution of the solar neutrino problem in general. Note however that there is an enhancement by a factor $\frac{m^3}{m' - m} \approx \frac{2m^4}{\Delta_{\text{atm}}} \approx 10^3 (\frac{m}{\text{eV}})$ in eq.(14) which partly compensates for the additional power of δ_τ but still one does not get the LMA solution. Depending on the sign of $m' - m$, now one can get $\tan^2 \theta_\odot < 1$ in case of the MSSM also. This can lead to additional enhancement for large $\tan \beta$. Thus one may get the required solar scale for some ranges in the parameter space for this model. However, the predicted low scale mixing is nearly maximal which is not preferred in case of the LMA solution.

One possible way of generating the texture in eq. (13) is to have a charged-lepton mass matrix which provides the atmospheric mixing angle s_2 corresponding to the rotation R_{23} in eq. (13). The neutrino mass matrix then will be block diagonal with its upper block

coinciding with the generic pseudo-Dirac structure of eq. (1). This structure is responsible for maximal solar mixing and vanishing m_{ee} which results in a suppressed $\Delta_\odot$. These problems can be circumvented if the upper block of the neutrino mass matrix corresponds to the generic pseudo-Dirac structure of eq. (2) instead of eq. (1). This leads to the the following texture:

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{\nu 0} &= R_{23}(\theta_2) \begin{pmatrix} a & b & 0 \\ b & -a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m' \end{pmatrix} R_{23}^T(\theta_2) , \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} a & bc_2 & -bs_2 \\ bc_2 & -ac_2^2 + m's_2^2 & s_2c_2(a + m') \\ -bs_2 & s_2c_2(a + m') & -as_2^2 + m'c_2^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

This is a simple 3×3 generalization of eq. (2). It satisfies the basic conditions in eq.(8) since the above $M_{\nu 0}$ is constructed to yield a degenerate pair and vanishing U_{e3} . The above texture represents a fairly general solution to the conditions of eq. (8) since $M_{\nu 0}$ in eq. (15) contains maximum allowed (namely four) independent parameters after imposition of eq. (8). The $\Delta_\odot$ as given by eq. (3) and a non-zero U_{e3} at the low scale are the predictions of this texture. Phenomenological consequences of these are already elaborated in [13]. In particular one gets the LMA solution for $m_{ee} = a \sim 0.2 - 0.4 \text{ eV}$.

B. Gauge-theoretical realization

We now discuss how the above textures can be realized in gauge theories. We restrict ourselves to a non-supersymmetric theory, with the gauge group $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ so far as the local symmetry is concerned. However to generate the required pattern of neutral and charged-lepton mass matrices, we impose global invariance under a “horizontal” or generation symmetry group³ $SU(2)_H \times U(1)_H$. Since we will employ the seesaw mechanism for generation of small masses for the neutrinos, we introduce three neutral right-handed

³A local horizontal $SU(2)_H$ symmetry has also been used recently in [27] to explain the bi-maximal pattern.

$SU(2)_L$ -singlet neutrinos, ν_{eR} , $\nu_{\mu R}$, $\nu_{\tau R}$. In order to generate a Majorana mass matrix among these right-handed neutrinos, we need to introduce $SU(2)_L$ -singlet scalars η and T . The number of $SU(2)_L$ -doublet scalars is increased to 4, viz., φ , χ_1 , χ_2 , and ϕ . These scalars all belong to the doublet representation of $SU(2)_L$, but differ in their $SU(2)_H \times U(1)_H$ transformation properties. The transformation properties of the leptons and the scalars are given in Table I.

	$SU(2)_L$	$U(1)_Y$	$SU(2)_H$	$U(1)_H$
(l_e, l_μ)	2	$-\frac{1}{2}$	2	0
l_τ	2	$-\frac{1}{2}$	1	1
$(\nu_{eR}, \nu_{\mu R})$	1	0	2	0
$\nu_{\tau R}$	1	0	1	-1
(e_R, μ_R)	1	-1	2	0
τ_R	1	-1	1	-1
φ	2	$-\frac{1}{2}$	1	0
χ_1	2	$-\frac{1}{2}$	1	-2
χ_2	2	$-\frac{1}{2}$	1	+2
ϕ	2	$-\frac{1}{2}$	2	-1
T	1	0	3	0
η	1	0	1	2

TABLE I. Transformation properties of lepton and scalar fields under the gauge group $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ and the horizontal symmetry group $SU(2)_H \times U(1)_H$

With the transformation properties given in Table I, the most general Yukawa couplings of the leptons with the various scalar fields consistent with the symmetries can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
-\mathcal{L}_Y = & h_1 (\bar{l}_e e_R + \bar{l}_\mu \mu_R) \tilde{\varphi} + h_2 \bar{l}_\tau (\tilde{\phi}_2 \mu_R - \tilde{\phi}_1 e_R) \\
& + h_3 (\bar{l}_e \tilde{\phi}_2 + \bar{l}_\mu \tilde{\phi}_1) \tau_R + h_4 (\bar{l}_\tau \tau_R \tilde{\chi}_1) \\
& + h'_1 (\bar{l}_e \nu_{eR} + \bar{l}_\mu \nu_{\mu R}) \varphi + h'_4 \bar{l}_\tau \nu_{\tau R} \chi_2 \\
& + ik (\nu_{eR}^T \nu_{\mu R}^T) \tau_2 \vec{T} \cdot \vec{\tau} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_{eR} \\ \nu_{\mu R} \end{pmatrix} \\
& + k' \nu_{\tau R}^T \nu_{\tau R} \eta + \text{H.c.}
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

In the above equation, the notation is that ϕ , which is a doublet under $SU(2)_L$ as well as $SU(2)_H$, is written as

$$\phi \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 & \phi_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{17}$$

where the $SU(2)_L$ doublets ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 have the components

$$\phi_1 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1^0 \\ \phi_1^- \end{pmatrix} \tag{18}$$

and

$$\phi_2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \phi_2^0 \\ \phi_2^- \end{pmatrix}. \tag{19}$$

The field $\tilde{\phi}$ conjugate to ϕ is given by

$$\tilde{\phi} = \tau_2 \phi^* \tau_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_2^+ & -\phi_1^+ \\ -\phi_2^{0*} & \phi_1^{0*} \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\phi}_2 & \tilde{\phi}_1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{20}$$

Since only electrically neutral components of the Higgs scalars are permitted to have nonzero vacuum expectation values (vev's), we first separate the Yukawa terms involving the neutral scalars:

$$-\mathcal{L} = h_1 (\bar{e}_L e_R + \bar{\mu}_L \mu_R) \varphi^{0*} + h_2 \bar{\tau}_L (-\phi_2^{0*} \mu_R - \phi_1^{0*} e_R)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +h_3 (-\bar{e}_L \phi_2^{0*} + \bar{\mu}_L \phi_1^{0*}) \tau_R + h_4 \bar{\tau}_L \tau_R \chi_1^{0*} \\
& +h'_1 (\bar{\nu}_{eL} \nu_{eR} + \bar{\nu}_{\mu L} \nu_{\mu R}) \varphi^0 + h'_4 \bar{\nu}_{\tau L} \nu_{\tau R} \chi_2^0 \\
& +k \begin{pmatrix} \nu_{eR}^T & \nu_{\mu R}^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} T^1 - iT^2 & -T^3 \\ -T^3 & -(T^1 + iT^2) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_{eR} \\ \nu_{\mu R} \end{pmatrix} \\
& +k' \nu_{\tau R}^T \nu_{\tau R} \eta + \text{H.c.}
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

When the neutral components of the scalar fields are replaced by their vacuum expectation values which arise due to spontaneous symmetry breaking, we get the mass terms of the charged and neutral leptons from (21). The vacuum expectation values for the neutral fields are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \varphi^0 \rangle &\equiv v; \quad \langle \chi_1^0 \rangle \equiv \kappa_1; \quad \langle \chi_2^0 \rangle \equiv \kappa_2; \\
\langle T^1 \rangle &\equiv v_R; \quad \langle T^3 \rangle \equiv v'_R; \\
\langle \phi_1^0 \rangle &\equiv v_1; \quad \langle \eta \rangle \equiv v_\eta.
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Note that we have set the vacuum expectation values for two of the neutral fields namely, ϕ_2^0 and T_2 to be zero. Using the invariance of the original Lagrangian under $SU(2)_L$ and $SU(2)_H$ one can always make $\langle \phi_2^0 \rangle$ zero without loss of generality⁴. The choice $\langle T_2 \rangle = 0$ follows if we demand CP invariance. Terms involving triplet in Eq. (21) are invariant under CP for a real κ if $T^1 + iT^2 \rightarrow T^1 - iT^2$, i.e. $(T^1, T^2) \rightarrow (T^1, -T^2)$ under CP. Requiring that vacuum also respects CP, one gets zero vacuum expectation value for T^2 . This can always be done by proper choice of parameters in the potential. We have allowed non-zero and real vacuum expectation values for all other neutral fields in the model.

With the choice of eq. (22) for the vev's, eq. (21) gives rise to the following mass matrices. The charged-lepton mass matrix is

$$M_l = \begin{pmatrix} m_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_{22} & m_{23} \\ m_{31} & 0 & m_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{23}$$

where

⁴We are assuming that the Higgs potential parameters are such that there is no charge breaking minima in this basis with zero $\langle \phi_2^0 \rangle$.

$$m_{11} = m_{22} = h_1 v; \quad m_{23} = h_3 v_1; \quad m_{31} = -h_2 v_1; \quad m_{33} = h_4 \kappa_1. \quad (24)$$

Note that the 2 – 3 block of the charged lepton mass matrix has the lopsided [28] texture which has been advocated as an explanation of the large atmospheric mixing [4].

The neutral-lepton mass matrix may be written as

$$M_N = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D \\ m_D^T & M_R \end{pmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

where

$$m_D = \begin{pmatrix} \mu & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mu' \end{pmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

and

$$M_R = \begin{pmatrix} M & M_1 & 0 \\ M_1 & -M & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M' \end{pmatrix}, \quad (27)$$

with

$$\mu = h'_1 v; \quad \mu' = h'_4 \kappa_2 \quad (28)$$

and

$$M = 2k v_R; \quad M_1 = -2k v'_R; \quad M' = 2k' v_\eta. \quad (29)$$

The neutral lepton mass matrix M_N can be block diagonalized as usual in the seesaw approximation,

$$\{|\mu|, |\mu'|\} \ll \{|M|, |M_1|, |M'|\}. \quad (30)$$

The resulting mass matrix for the light neutrinos is, in the seesaw limit,

$$m_\nu = -m_D^T M_R^{-1} m_D = \frac{1}{M'(M^2 + M_1^2)} \begin{pmatrix} -\mu^2 M & -\mu^2 M_1 & 0 \\ -\mu^2 M_1 & \mu^2 M & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu'^2 (M^2 + M_1^2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (31)$$

This has the form

$$m_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} a & b & 0 \\ b & -a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m' \end{pmatrix}, \quad (32)$$

identical to the one discussed in Sec. III A. As discussed earlier, it gives rise to a pseudo-Dirac neutrino, and implies large mixing between the first two generations, for values of a and b comparable in magnitude.

The charged-lepton mass matrix leads to an additional 23 rotation, which generates the atmospheric mixing angle. Eq.(23) can be used to obtain

$$M_l M_l^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} m_{11}^2 & 0 & m_{11}m_{31} \\ 0 & m_{11}^2 + m_{23}^2 & m_{23}m_{33} \\ m_{11}m_{31} & m_{23}m_{33} & m_{13}^2 + m_{33}^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (33)$$

The above matrix leads to the required charged lepton masses with $m_{11} \sim \mathcal{O}(m_e)$, $m_{23} \sim m_{33} \sim \mathcal{O}(m_\tau)$ and $m_{31} \sim \mathcal{O}(m_\mu)$. Eq.(33) can be diagonalized in the limit $m_e \rightarrow 0$ by a rotation $R_{23}(\theta_2)$ in the 2 – 3 plane with the mixing angle θ_2 given by

$$\tan 2\theta_2 = \frac{2(m_{23}m_{33})}{m_{33}^2 + m_{13}^2 - m_{23}^2}. \quad (34)$$

This angle is large for the values of parameters quoted above, which correctly reproduce the charged lepton masses. In this way, eqs.(23) and (32) reproduce the texture of eq.(15) in the limiting case of zero electron mass. The effect of introducing a non-zero $m_{11} \sim m_e$ on the mixing is negligible. As seen from eq.(33), a non-zero m_{11} leads to a U_{e3} at the high scale

$$U_{e3} \approx \frac{m_e m_\mu}{m_\tau^2} \approx 10^{-5}$$

This is negligible and does not effect the phenomenological consequences discussed in this paper.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have examined the consequences of a general 3×3 flavour-basis neutrino mass matrix which satisfies the conditions necessary for two eigenvalues to be equal in magnitude and

opposite in sign, wherein radiative corrections lead to a pseudo-Dirac structure, and in addition, which leads to a vanishing U_{e3} matrix element at tree level. CP conservation was assumed. As shown earlier [13], these assumptions lead to a strong correlation between the neutrino mass m_{ee} determined from $0\nu\beta\beta$ experiments and the solar scale. Specific testable phenomenological predictions of the scenario considered here are very small ($\leq .01$) U_{e3} , and m_{ee} as well as the electron neutrino mass close to the present experimental limit if the LMA solution is verified.

General important theoretical results shown to follow from this scenario were that (i) radiative corrections in MSSM are inconsistent with the requirement of $\tan^2\theta_\odot \leq 1$ demanded by the LMA and LOW solutions of the solar neutrino problem, (ii) the inverted mass hierarchy, realized as for example in models with $L_e - L_\mu - L_\tau$ symmetry, cannot lead to the LMA solution, and (iii) maximal solar mixing at tree level, which is simple from a conceptual and theoretical point of view, does not decrease appreciably after radiative corrections, and is therefore ruled out in the context of the LMA solution. In the last case, even the pseudo-Dirac splitting is too small, except possibly for the vacuum solution for solar neutrinos.

The stringent relations among the elements of the neutrino mass matrix for the scenario do not necessarily require fine-tuning of parameters. They are shown in a couple of examples to follow from some simple textures. A gauge-theoretic realization of such a texture was also explicitly worked out.

-
- [1] M. Frigerio and A. Yu. Smirnov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B640** (2002) 233 [hep-ph/0202247] and hep-ph/0207366.
 - [2] For reviews of various models, see, A.Yu. Smirnov, hep-ph/9901208; R. N. Mohapatra, hep-ph/9910365; A.S. Joshipura, *Pramana*, **54** (2000) 119; G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, hep-ph/0206077; M. C. Gonzalez Garcia and Y. Nir, hep-ph/0206077.
 - [3] A. Yu. Smirnov, *Phys. Rev.* **D48** (1993) 3264; G. Dutta and A.S. Joshipura, *Phys. Rev.* **D51** (1995) 3838.
 - [4] S. Barr and I. Dorsner, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 585** (2000) 79.

- [5] D. Caldwell and R.N. Mohapatra, *Phys. Rev.* **D48** (1993) 3259; A.S. Joshipura, *Zeit. fur Physik*, **C64** (1994) 31; A. Ioannisian and J.W.F. Valle, *Phys. Lett.* **B332** (1994) 93; E. Ma, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 2514; E.J. Chun and S. K. Kang, *Phys. Rev.* **D64** (2001) 09790 and hep-ph/9912524; E. Ma and G. Rajasekaran, *Phys. Rev.* **D64** (2001) 113012; E. Ma, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **83** (1999) 2514 and hep-ph/0201225; R. Adhikari, E. Ma and G. Rajsekaran, *Phys. Lett.* **B486** (2000) 134; M. Fukugita, M. Tanimoto and T. Yanagida, *Phys. Rev.* **57** (1998) 4429; M. Tanimoto, *Phys. Lett.* **483 B** (2000) 417 and *Phys. Rev.* **59** (1999) 017304; H. Minakata and O. Yasuda, hep-ph/9609276; F. Vissani, hep-ph/9708483; E.J. Chun and S. Pokorski, *Phys. Rev.* **D62** (2000) 053001.
- [6] R. Barbieri *et al.* *Phys. Lett.* **B445** (1999) 239
- [7] A.S. Joshipura, *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999) 053002; R.N. Mohapatra, A. Perez-Lorenzana and C.A. de Pires, *Phys. Lett.* **B474** (2000) 355; A.S. Joshipura and S.D. Rindani, *Phys. Lett. B* **464** (1999) 239 and *Eur. Phys. J.* **C14** (2000) 85; H.S. Goh, R.N. Mohapatra and S.P. Ng, hep-ph/0205131; L. Lavoura, *Phys. Rev. D* **62** (2000) 093011; W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, *Phys. Rev. D* **62** (2000) 093012; *JHEP* **07** (2001) 045; R.N. Mohapatra, hep-ph/0107274; *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 091301.
- [8] K.S. Babu and R.N. Mohapatra, *Phys. Lett.* **B532** (2002) 77.
- [9] Y. Nomura, and T. Yanagida, *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 017303; S. Davidson and S. F. King, *Phys. Lett.* **B445** (1998) 191; R.N. Mohapatra and S. Nussinov, *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999) 013002 and *Phys. Lett.* **B441** (1998) 299; C. Jarlskog *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B449** (1999) 240; M. Jezabek and Y. Sumino, *Phys. Lett.* **B457** (1999) 139; Yue-Liang Wu, hep-ph/9905222; C.H. Albright and S.M. Barr, *Phys. Lett.* **B461** (1999) 218; C.S. Kim and J. D. Kim, *Phys. Rev. D* **61** (2000) 057302; R.N. Mohapatra and A. Perez-Lorenzana, *Phys. Lett.* **B474** (2000) 355; Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, *Phys. Lett.* **B482** (2000) 145; A. Ghosal, *Phys. Rev. D* **62** (2000) 092001; T. Kitabaysahi and M. Yasue, hep-ph/0006040; Y. Koide and A. Ghosal, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001) 037301; K. Choi *et al.* *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 113013; K.S. Babu and S.M. Barr, *Phys. Lett.* **B525** (2002) 289; E. Ma, S. Roy and D.P. Roy, *Phys. Lett.* **B525** (2002) 101; B. Brahmachari

- and A.S. Choubey, *Phys. Lett.* **B531** (2002) 99; C. Giunti and M. Tanimoto, hep-ph/0207096.
- [10] L. Wolfenstein, Nucl. Phys. **B 186** (1981) 147; S.T. Petcov, Phys. Lett. **110 B** (1982) 245; S.T. Petcov and C.N. Leung, Phys. Lett. **125 B** (1983) 461.
- [11] A.S. Joshipura and S.D. Rindani, Phys. Lett. **494 B** (2000) 114.
- [12] A.S. Joshipura and S.D. Rindani, hep-ph/0202064.
- [13] A.S. Joshipura, *Phys. Lett.* **B543** (2002) 276 [hep-ph/0205038].
- [14] K.S. Babu, C.N. Leung and J. Pantaleone, Phys. Lett. **B 139** (1993) 191; P.H. Chankowski, Z. Pluciennik, Phys. Lett. **B 316** (1993) 312; S. Antusch *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 519** (2001) 238 and Phys. Lett. **B 525** (2002) 130.
- [15] P.H. Chankowski and S. Pokorski, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A17** (2002) 575.
- [16] J. Ellis *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **C9** (1999) 310; J. Ellis and S. Lola, Phys. Lett. **110 458** (1999) 389; A. Casas *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B556** (1999) 3; Nucl. Phys. **B569** (1999) 82; Nucl. Phys. **B573** (2000) 652; JHEP **9909** (1999) 015; A. Dighe and A.S. Joshipura, hep-ph/0010079; N. Haba Y. Matsui and N. Okamura, Eur. Phys. J. **C17** (2000) 513; N. Haba *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 489** (2000) 184; N. Haba *et al.* Prog. Theor. Phys. **103** (2000) 145; N. Haba and N. Okamura, Eur. Phys. J. **C14** (2000) 347; E. J. Chun, Phys. Lett. **B505** (2001) 155; K. R. S. Balaji *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84** (2000) 5034 and Phys. Lett. **B481** (2000) 33; G. Dutta, hep-ph/0202097 and hep-ph/0203222; N. Haba, N. Okumura and M. Sugiura, Prog. Theor. Phys. **103** (2000) 367.
- [17] A.S. Joshipura, S.D. Rindani and N. Singh, hep-ph/0211378.
- [18] H.V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **A12** (2001) 147; H.V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus *et al.*, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A 16** (2002) 2409; C.E. Aalseth *et al.*, hep-ex/0202018; H.L. Harney, hep-ph/0205293 and H. V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus, hep-ph/0205228.
- [19] G.L. Fogli *et al.*, hep-ph/0106247; J.N. Bahcall *et al.*, hep-ph/0106258; A. Bandyopadhyay *et al.*, hep-ph/0106264, P. Krastev and A.Yu. Smirnov, hep-ph/0108177; V. Barger *et al.*, hep-ph/0106207; C.V.K. Baba, D. Indumathi and M.V.N. Murthy, *Phys. Rev.* **D65** (2002) 073033.

- [20] A. Bandyopadhyay *et al.*, hep-ph/00204286; V. Barger *et al.*, hep-ph/0204253; J.N. Bahcall *et al.*, hep-ph/0204314; P. de Hollanda and A.Yu. Smirnov, hep-ph/0205241.
- [21] SNO collaboration, Q.R. Ahmed *et al.* nucl-ex/0204008 and nucl-ex/0204009.
- [22] A.Yu. Smirnov, hep-ph/0209131.
- [23] M.C. Gonzalez Garcia *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D63** (2001) 013007.
- [24] S. Antusch *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B544** (2002) 1.
- [25] T. Miura, T. Shindou and E. Takasugi, hep-ph/02060207.
- [26] R. Barbieri, L.J. Hall, G.L. Kane and G.G. Ross, hep-ph/9901228.
- [27] R. Kuchimanchi and R.N. Mohapatra, hep-ph/0207110 and hep-ph/0207373.
- [28] K.S. Babu and S. M. Barr, *Phys. Lett.* **B381** (1996) 202.